

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.		Applicant(s)	
	09/038,230		KOYANAGI ET AL.	
	Examiner		Art Unit	
	Daniel S. Metzmaier		1712	

All Participants:

(1) Daniel S. Metzmaier.

(2) Julie W Meder.

Date of Interview: 3 November 2006

Type of Interview:

☒ Telephonic

☐ Video Conference

☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Status of Application: Amended

(3) _____

(4) _____

Time: ~ 12:10 PM

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:
none.

Claims discussed:
none.

Prior art documents discussed:
none.


Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:
See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.


DANIEL S. METZMAIER
PRIMARY EXAMINER
ART UNIT 1712

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Examiner noted that claim 5 did not further limit claim 6 since the presence of ionic components would have been present in the materials of claim 6, said ionic components have not been removed from the claimed compositions, and are characterized as stable. Examiner suggested cancellation of claim 5 as redundant by examiner's amendment. Said amendment was authorized. .